

**UDC 156**

**Yelena EVSTIFEEVA**

*Doctor of Philosophy, professor, vice rector for development of personnel, manager of  
department of psychology and philosophy*

**Svetlana FILIPPCHENKOVA**

*Doctor of psychological sciences, associate professor, professor of the department of  
psychology and philosophy*

**Andrey KHARCHENKO**

*Candidate of philosophical sciences, applicant of department of psychology and  
philosophy*

*Tver State Technical University (Russian Federation)*

*pif1997@mail.ru*

### **SELF-CONCEPT TRANSFORMATION IN MOBILITY PRACTICES: THE RISK OF TAKING RESPONSIBILITY**

*The article describes the transformation of Self-concept as a dissonance between self-identity and social identities, which, in turn, creates a problem of what I term “the risk of taking responsibility” which may arise in mobility practices. The risk of taking responsibility is understood here as the ability to swiftly find an answer to the “Who am I?” question in case of the conflict between self-identity and multiple social identities.*

**Keywords:** self-concept, mobility practices, risk of taking responsibility

In a broad sense, the Self-concept consists of two parts: conscious as well as an unconscious/reflective process of self-discovery and identity formed through interactions with other people. Its essential features are integrity and sustainability, and it is based on the things one chooses and accepts, the so-called positive “semantics.” In the formation of the Self-concept converge two key parts. The first part includes the social nature of the “genome,” historical experience, the manifestation or origin of the identity. The second part consists of self-authenticity, selfhood, autonomy and self-constitution in the format of “freedom and responsibility.” Reflective self is considered a simultaneous act of self-denial and self-perception through interaction with others (the Other). Gradual disintegration of one’s self-image results in the so-called “amnesia” of the processes of socialization and leads to the suicide of one’s self-perception. Generally, this Self-concept disintegration is seen as one’s inability to find a compromise between social identities and personal identity which entails what has been called the “risk of taking responsibility.”

The phenomenon of identity is generally understood as the multi-vectored self-perception which formation is influenced by a shared, accepted, experiential example the person has in front of him\her. Identity is understood as the result of the process of integration of a person, sociality and society, as well as the ability to form self-perception, to pose essential questions about oneself as well as to give possible answers to these questions. A model or pattern of identity implies not only self-perception, but also reflective self-identity, influenced by the presence of important people in our lives (the meaningful Other).

The phenomenon of identity deals with how we identify ourselves with the image we have chosen and which, for its part, changes through social interaction. This chosen image plays a central role in the identity formation. An image is an indivisible whole. In historical and philosophical discourse, the image (adios) has an ontological association, commensurate with either idea or form. The epistemological dimension of the image can be found in new European philosophy. An image is a fragment of experience, it is imagined, recognized every time by the one who sees it. It is in this regard that an image forms identity (Origen). In the Hegelian version, 'image' (idea, eidos) appears as a real unified being in time. Image is a manifestation of the essence.

In modern philosophical and psychological discourses, the image is considered in its axiological dimension. It is believed to be a part of the axiological structures of consciousness, a symbolic incarnation, and an integral component of one's identity. The identity can be formalized and presented as a fraction of the "image" (numerator) and the "the Self" modality (denominator). If we consider the "image" some "fluid condition" (encompassing such connotations as vague, are flexible, fragmentary, imitative, inspired, glitch) it will form a corresponding "negative", vague self-concept. Various socio-cultural situations demonstrate how once positive connotations of an image can turn into negative ones. For example, the image of the "home" is associated with the boundaries of the public and private life. Today, the "home" metaphor and its socio-cultural content have changed dramatically. Modern technologies have intensified the breakdown of the boundaries of privacy; it has become fragmented and unsustainable. The loss of privacy in the life of an individual in the era of globalism and total individual control turns the self-concept into a problem, in particular its social identities part.

The problem of identity and self-identity begins with the absence of the "Self" as one's inside fulcrum, as the center of one's Universe, which entails the loss of self-identity and self-constitution – essential parts of the trinity of "Self-responsibility-act." In ontological optics, responsibility is understood here as one's ability, opportunity and competence to reproduce and construct one's identity based on one's personal and social activity, one's praxis, which commits the person to self-control, self-forecasting, self-designing and self-management. The person (or the "author") is the one, who bears responsibility for his/her actions, which depend on one's stance. This stance exposes the choice the person has made in the form of his will expression, will effort, consistent with verified degrees of freedom and disposition in relation to external circumstances. In axiological terms, responsibility is recognized as ethical sensitivity to the Other. Responsibility is the step by step inclusion into the realm of "that which is due", and adoption by the person of a social and moral code of "honor" and "dignity."

Involvement in the zone of responsibility implies intention and willingness to account for the consequences of one's practical actions, considering the future. The coherence of one's self and reality is an essential condition for taking responsibility, which is understood as differentiation and the ability to distinguish oneself from the outside world. As a personal quality, as a socio-psychological feature of a person, responsibility is considered as a prerequisite and the root cause of self-changes. Responsibility is a desire of a person to take charge (or to "respond") for decision-making, and the search for the source of decision-making in the outside world.

To understand the concept of practice we use the methodology of post-non-classical rationality. By mobility practices, we mean such social activity, in which members of society engage via cooperation, communication and interaction in conditions of rapid pace of technological change. By this rapid technological change we understand the process of

acceleration, not only an increase in the speed of this change, but also the process of independent navigation. The “symptoms” of such mobility practices include a wide range of modified behavioral patterns, communication models and identity methods. Inherent in modern mobile practices is the riskogenics effect, which results from human and social activities, development of new technologies and techniques, all of which causes identity transformation.

In relation to mobility practices the risk of taking responsibility is understood as the ability to quickly find answers in conditions of uncertainty, make decisions that minimize possible risks or determine ways of self-protection in the situation of the so called conflict of interest arising between one’s self-identity and multiple social identities. The problem has two dimensions: on the one hand risks arise in social sphere (in society, communities, groups) but on the other hand they are generated by the person (by an individual, personality, subject). The risk of taking responsibility is one’s constructive self-presentation, rooted in personal and social experience, which makes it possible to remain synergistic and self-confident in a dignified way in any non-standard, uncertain, non-linear situation that requires solving of unresolved questions. At the personal level, the risk of responsibility is understood as follows: The formation of self-identity is a productive act of creation, self-craftsmanship, a possessive feeling of oneself. Origin of self, a sense of authenticity, selfhood, autonomy and sovereignty allow one to answer the question “Who Am I?” and to find a starting point in oneself. Such existential completeness breeds freedom and one’s self- as well as social responsibility. Through the mechanism of socialization, interaction with other people, relational self reveals itself, which is considered a condition of an act as a practical action. The modality of the “Self” in the structure of the subjective reality of a person and one’s self-images are components of identity.

We believe that recognizing and accepting the risks of taking responsibility to a certain extent allows us to manage conflicts emerging between self-identity and multiple-social identities. Practical experience demonstrates that awareness and reflections on the destructive consequences of alternative identities help a person make the right choice from a number of identities. Perfect examples of the Self-concept transformation in mobility practices are network identities and the phenomena of the “selfie”. We highlight in our works the risks of taking responsibility immanent in these identity transformations.

Thus, network ontology generates de-individualization, anonymity, coded identity, its branded modality, unification and ambivalence. The dissociation process of real identity takes results from the erasure of the objective boundaries of the real and virtual worlds, the equalization of the past and the future, the hybridization of real and virtual identities. Network experiments with one’s own identity result in its “schizoidization” with the dominating relational factor (“I am with others” and not the autonomous “I am on my own”), which can be understood as emphasized, additive belonging to a certain reference group. As a result, psychologists talk about an unrealistic variability of personal characteristics and a lack of emotional contact.

The phenomenon of the “Selfie” in conditions of multiple identities and as a rule of the apparent potentiality of various structures of one’s self reveals a “crisis of identity” as a lack of both one’s self-image, and personal and social future. The Selfie appears as a mechanism of imaginary and symbolic (self) identification, which makes it possible to form an attractive image of oneself. A certain visual identity emerges, which is presented in most cases externally via the Internet, in search for love and recognition. The Selfie is an edited image of one’s individual self and at the same time an act of losing one’s relational self which is defined by our relations with others (the Other).

The “selfie” phenomenon confirms that the main purpose of technological expansion which is underway in risky mobile practices is to maintain total control. In psychoanalysis, the Other's view is proportionate to that level of dominance, or the “panopticon” (as it is known in M. Foucault's concept). Modern mobility, every movement – all this is accompanied by digital tracking and control and no one remains outside the panopticon – this is one of the scenarios of the harsh future. Software systems that measure, track, observe, control provide, among other things, extensive co-presence. Philosophical reflection on the phenomenon of the “selfie” also calls for the understanding that human consciousness, presenting the consolidation point of the processes of socialization and individuation, of internal and external, is connected with the risk of taking responsibility for the uniqueness of such consolidation.

The existence of the risks of taking responsibility for the transformation of one's self-concept is illustrated in the results of a socio-psychological survey we've conducted among students. Obviously, young people are indeed the ones who form the “high-risk group”, most affected by modern technologies, which are aimed at desubjectivization. It also turns out that young people preach the symbols and values of uniformity and unification.

It is well known that spiritual and moral values are considered the most important in “traditional” cultures, and they play a major role in formation of stable, integral, positive identities of both a person and the society, their ethos. The so-called “traditional” hierarchy of value priorities formed in the process of self discovery can be presented in a descending order as follows: 1. spiritual and moral values (as indicators of personal authenticity, selfhood, autonomy, self-identity) 2. Pro-social systems of values (as indicators of social identities), 3. mobility values (as indicators of a high degree of trust, and formation of global identity). The hierarchy which has currently been formed in modern riskogenic mobility practices differs dramatically from that traditional one. Today we can say that a new pyramid of value priorities is being formed in the consciousness of the young (*is structuring the consciousness of the youth*).

Such conclusion results from a study conducted by the Center for psychological support for the employees and students of the Department of Psychology and Philosophy of Tver State Technical University in 2017-2019. 350 students of three Tver universities (Tver State Technical University, Tver State Medical University, Tver State Agricultural Academy) at the ages from 17 to 24 took part in the study; among them were 205 female students and 145 male students. A uniquely designed socio-psychological questionnaire served as the main exploratory tool of the survey.

The results of the survey conducted on the basis of the uniquely designed questionnaire, are the following: the majority (56%) of the respondents believe that global identity, represented as personality-subjective qualities (such as mobility, communication skills, trust, tolerance) is considered the main value in the axiological structure of consciousness. About one third (28%) of the students identify themselves as having highly significant prosocial values (the so called “markers” of social identities), which are characterized through reflexivity, project thinking, and responsibility. And only 16% of the respondents consider self-concept their fundamental guiding light. The self-concept is defined by moral and spiritual values, autonomy, sense of social justice, personal dignity.

The abovementioned results of the survey show that the younger generation in Russia tends to make their choice in favor of a new pyramid of value priorities, not typical for Russian society. Such priorities entail the formation and development of relevant personality-subjective qualities. Similar results have been obtained in other domestic studies.

### References:

1. Бурдьё П. Структуры, habitus, практики // Современная социальная теория: Бурдьё, Гидденс, Хабермас: учеб. пособие / Сост., пер., вступ. ст. А. В. Леденевой; Науч. ред. А. В. Леденева, И. В. Давыдова. – Новосибирск: Изд-во Новосибирского ун-та, 1995. – 119 с.
2. Вызовы современности: социальное знание и ценностные императивы. Монография / под ред. Э.Ю. Майковой. Тверь: ТвГТУ, 2016. - 160 с.
3. Гидденс Э. Последствия современности. М., 2011. – 352 с.
4. Карпов А.В., Психология рефлексивных механизмов деятельности. — М.: Изд-во «Институт психологии РАН», 2004. - 424 с.
5. Кравченко С.А. Сосуществование рискофобии и рискофилии- проявление «нормальной аномии» // Социологические исследования 2017. - №2- № 2. - С. 3-13
6. Попова О.В. Интимные технологии и кризис социальности // Человек. 2017. - №1. - С. 148–149..
7. Постноклассика: философия, наука, культура: Коллективная монография / Отв. ред. Л.П. Киященко и В.С. Степин. СПб.: Издательский дом «Мир», 2009 – 672 с.
8. Современные социальные практики: технологические подходы, векторы и траектории развития / Монография / под ред. Е.А. Евстифеевой, А.А. Тягунова, С.И. Филиппченковой. Тверь: ТвГТУ, 2017. - 160 с.;
9. Урри Дж. Мобильности М.: Издательская и консалтинговая группа «Праксис», 2012 – 576 с.
10. Харченко А.Ю. Конфигурация идентичностей и риск ответственности в социальных практиках мобильности. Автореф. дисс. канд.филос.н., Москва, МГОУ, 2018. – 24 с.

**Елена ЕВСТИФЕЕВА**  
**Светлана ФИЛИППЧЕНКОВА**  
**Андрей ХАРЧЕНКО**

### **ПРЕОБРАЗОВАНИЕ САМОИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ В МОБИЛЬНЫХ ПРАКТИКАХ: РИСК**

#### **Резюме**

В статье представлено описание трансформации самоидентичности как диссонанса «идентичности» и социальных идентификаций, что порождает проблему риска ответственности в мобильных практиках. Под риском ответственности понимается оперативная способность найти «идентификационный» ответ на конфликт «интересов» самоидентичности и множественных социальных идентификаций.

**Ключевые слова:** самоидентичность, мобильные практики, риск ответственности.

**Yelena YEVSTİFEYEVA**  
**Svetlana FİLİPÇENKOVA**  
**Andrey XARÇENKO**

## **MOBİL TƏCRÜBƏDƏ ÖZÜNÜİDENTİKLİYİN TRANSFORMASIYASI**

### **Xülasə**

Məqalədə özünüidentikliyin transformasiyası “Mən – identiklik” sosial identifikasiya dissonansı kimi təsvir olunur və bildirilir ki, bu mobil təcrübədə cavabdehlik riski problemi yaradır. Cavabdehlik riski dedikdə, özünüidentikliyin “maraq” münaqişəsinə və çoxlu sosial identifikasiyalara identiklik cavabının tapılması üçün operativ qabiliyyət başa düşülür.

**Açar sözlər:** özünüidentiklik, mobil təcrübələr, cavabdehlik riski

**Rəyçi:** AMEA Fəlsəfə İnstitutunun direktoru, f.e.d., prof. İlham Məmmədzadə  
**Qəbul edilib:** 16. 11.2019